**REMARKS**

Claim 38 is amended. Support can be found on page 2, lines 7-11; page 5, lines 27-31; and page 6, lines 18-23 of the specification.

No new matter is entered by these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 38-43, 45-51, 56 and 57 were rejected in the Official Action as allegedly being obvious over the proposed combination of newly-cited Rade (U.S. 1,531,569) in view of either Llorente Hompanera (U.S. Publication Application No. 2001/0043977) or Sollich (GB 697,071). That rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Rade discloses an outer shell 10 or a ring with an outturned flange 11 on its upper edge and inturned flange 12 at its lower edge. The flange 12 is of sufficient depth to support a bottom plate 3 which is removable through the top of the ring 10. The plate 13 is provided at suitable intervals with notches 14 adapted to receive studs 15 which are preferably pressed inwardly from the ring 10 near its lower edge in position to hold the plate 13 flat upon the flange 12. See, col. 1, line 53 to col. 2, line 67.

Rade also discloses that in order to assemble the plate 13 on the ring 10, the notches 14 are introduced through the respective studs 15 of the ring 19, and the plate 13 is

slid or turned upon the flange 12 so as to dispose the uninterrupted edge portion of the plate beneath the studs 15 to lock the plate in the ring. See, col. 2, lines 90-98.

Contrary to the position taken by the rejection, Rade fails to disclose an upper lip defining with a lower lip, a radially opened groove, and the plate which is pinned against the lower lip by the upper lip as claimed in claim 38.

Although Rade discloses an inturned flange 12 at its lower edge, it fails to disclose an upper lip which extends radially, but rather discloses a stud having a different structure. The stud in Fig. 1 apparently has the shape of a cylinder. Thus, the space between the stud and the inturned flange cannot be regarded as a groove which extends radially.

Rade also fails to disclose flexible lips and the plate-shape base stiffener which is removably clipped into the groove as claimed in claim 38.

The flexibility of the lips in the present mould makes it possible to clip the plate into the groove. The plate can be easily inserted in and released from the groove. Once inserted in the groove, the plate is pinned between the flexible lips in a stable and tight manner. The flexibility of the upper lip makes it possible to apply strength against the plate to maintain it effectively.

Llorente Hompanera merely discloses the use of silicone in a mold for culinary preparation, which thus

utilizes the flexibility of silicone as an alternative mechanism for facilitating the removal of the baked good from the mold.

Sollich discloses a flexible mold made of rubber comprising a rigid plate-shaped base stiffener 4 vulcanised at the outer surface of the bottom wall of the mould.

Thus, the suggested combination of Rade in view of Llorente Hompanera and Sollich would not result in the claimed mould, because neither Llorente Hompanera nor Sollich would have provided the skilled artisan with any apparent reason to replace the outer shell with an outturned flange on its upper edge and inturned flange at its lower edge of Rade with flexible lips forming a groove.

Claims 38-43, 45-53, 56 and 57 were also rejected in the Official Action as allegedly being obvious over the proposed combination of newly-cited Trockels et al. (DE 4222676 A1) in view of Liotto et al. (U.S. 4,644,858). That rejection is also respectfully traversed, for the following reasons.

Trockels discloses a mould 1 including an annular metallic wall 2 provided with a planar support means, and a removable plate 3. Plate 3 can be made of metal, paperboard, silicone, or a flexible material (paragraph 17 of the English

translation). The annular wall 2 can be covered with silicone, PTFE, or rubber silicone.

However, Trockes fails to disclose a flexible hollow piece made from an elastomer material. It also fails to disclose flexible upper lip defining with a lower flexible lip, a radially opened groove, and the plate which is pinned against the flexible lower lip by the flexible upper lip as claimed in claim 38.

Liotto discloses a rigid mould having a split cylindrical shell 11 formed by complementary arcuate sections 11A and 11B articulated to each other by a vertical hinge. The cylindrical shell 11 comprises a circular bead 12 and a ring 11D defining a circular inner groove 13 adapted to receive lip 10C of base 10 to form a leakproof seal. See col. 3, lines 23-44.

However, Liotto fails to remedy the deficiencies of Trockels because the base is only inserted in the circular inner groove. The circular bead is rigid and does not exert strength onto the base. Thus, the suggested combination of Trockels in view of Liotto would not result in the claimed mould

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance with claims 38-43, 45-53, 56

and 57, as amended. Allowance and passage to issue on that basis are accordingly respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Andrew J. Patch/

Andrew J. Patch, Reg. No. 32,925
Customer No. 00466
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573